DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 325 465 SP 032 702

AUTHOR Zelazek, John R.; And Others
TITLE 1990 Teacher Education Follow-Up Study.
PUB DATE May 90
NOTE 62p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142) --
Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employer Attitudes; Higher Education; Program Attitudes; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Student Teacher Attitudes; Surveys; *Teacher Attitudes; *Teacher Education Programs
IDENTIFIERS Central Missouri State University

ABSTRACT

This report represents the second follow-up study by the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University (CMSU). The TEAC conducts and publishes results of periodic assessments and evaluations of the university's teacher education programs by soliciting input from: (1) the university teacher education faculty; (2) preservice teacher education candidates; (3) inservice teachers and other graduates of the teacher education program; and (4) employers of educators prepared by the university. Graduate and student teacher respondents were given questions on biographical background, current employment status, and attitudes toward the teacher education program at CMSU. Questions addressed to the other respondents asked for a broader assessment of the program. The results of all assessments and evaluations will be applied to the current teacher education program and shared with school districts that employ the university's graduates. Background information and current activities of the TEAC are presented in this paper, and the survey instruments with their findings are reproduced. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED325465

1990 Teacher Education Follow-Up Study

May, 1990

by

Dr. JOHN R. ZELAZEK
Dr. SHARON L. LAMSON
Dr. JIM SYLWESTER
Dr. BILL DOWNS

Central Missouri State University
Warrensburg, Missouri, 64093-5086
(816)-429-4235

SP 033 702

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC).

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TOPIC	
Introduction	1
Background Information	2
Current Activities	3
Conclusions and Recommendations	4-5
Surveys	6
TEAC Faculty Survey	6-12
TEAC Graduate Survey	13-19
TEAC Employer Survey	20-25
TEAC Student Teacher Survey	26-32
TEAC Foundations of Education Survey	33-36
TEAC Data Base	37
A COMPARISON OF ALL 1984 THROUGH 1989 BSE AND BME GRADUATES	38-48
A COMPARISON OF ALL 1984 THROUGH 1989 ELEMENTARY EDUCATION GRADUATES	49-51
INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDUCATION GRADUATES1984-1989	52
INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 1150 STUDENTS, 1987-1990	53
INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 2100 STUDENTS, 1984-1989	54
C-BASE SCORE FOR ALL CMSU STUDENTS-4/88 THROUGH 3/90	55-56
PROGRAM RETENTION 1984 THOUGH 1989 BASED ON EDCI 2100 ENROLLMENT	57-58
References	59

"Why assess the outcomes of higher education? The classic answer says we do it for two reasons: to find out what has been accomplished and to find out how we might accomplish it better" (Manning, 1980, p.1). The ideal assessment would find all parties agreeing on the time-line and its potential significance. There would be no "we-they" division between the people who are conducting the assessment, the people who are undergoing it, or between the authorizing group and the group(s) under study.

Assessment should be approved as an open ended learning situation in which everybody would profit. There is no single formula for assessment to fit everyone's needs, all units, or all possible topics. It is possible to be involved in a one-week assessment at the same time one is involved in an assessment that may last five or six years. Assessment is part of life.

The process and results of assessment are significant only if the people most directly affected really want and incorporate the outcomes (Kunkel, 1988). Some faculty or administrators display fear, anxiety, or stress when they are made aware of a future assessment. Fear, anxiety, and stress are three personality elements of faculty or administration members who usually suggest or always feel that things are not always what they seem to be. These people tend to view, or are very sure, that all of the cards are stacked against them. They tend to believe that there is usually a hidden agenda for the assessment. Typical complaints by these people range from they are wasting my time; assessment money should be put into salaries; the main reason for assessment is to increase my teaching load; to a department or department chair is about to be reallocated. Others agree with assessment regardless of what is happening. They just want change and they want it fast. These people are very stressed and are as much a problem as the aforementioned complainers.

Ideally an acceptable assessment system should be selected and supported by all parties involved. It seems that the solutions to the problems surrounding assessment lie with the development of various techniques of dealing with, and admitting to our personal fears, anxieties, and stresses. Our primary focus must be higher education. Everyone who works in it shares responsibility for the quality of its work, its effectiveness, and its presentation to the society (Zelazek, 1989).

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This report represents the second Follow-up Study by the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, Warrensburg, Missouri. TEAC was established in April of 1988 by the joint efforts of Dr. Joe Huber, Dean of the College of Education and Human Services and the Professional Education Faculty. TEAC's function and specific charges were devised and current individual committee members are as follows: John R. Zelazek, chair, Sharon L. Lamson, Jim Sylwester, and Bill Downs.

Central Missouri State University designed an assessment and evaluation system as part of its teacher education program as a result of the need for quality teachers in our nation. The Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) is a multifaceted system that conducts and publishes results of periodic assessments and evaluations of CMSU's Teacher Education Programs by soliciting input from: a) CMSU teacher education faculty, b) Pre-service teacher education candidates, c) In-service teachers and other graduates of the teacher education program, and d) Employers of educators prepared by CMSU. The results of all assessments and evaluations are then applied to the current teacher education program and shared with school districts that employ CMSU graduates.

TEAC and the Office of Institutional Research and Testing Services have jointly developed a data base of 7,100 past and present CMSU students and coordinates that data with the Office of Clinical Services. TEAC has designed four major surveys based on the Technical Series 88-1 published by the National Center for Research on Teacher Education, Michigan State University, Lansing, Michigan; and responded to the requests for summaries of student data based on individual criteria by various CMSU departments and ad hoc committees. The response time for this data is very quick, most often just a few hours. The response time for the same data from the various other sources on the CMSU campus would be several days to many weeks. TEAC has now completed its second year. It has risen from a little known committee gathering data to a University entity that has high visibility and a major impact on teacher education programs at CMSU. From its extensive data base of student descriptors that has been gleaned from an eight year time span of enrollment, to its four additional data bases that are generated from the surveys of current students, graduates and employers, TEAC is now able to describe the nature of the students and perceptions of the teacher education program at CMSU.

During the past two years TEAC has also devised an "At-Risk" definition for college students and is monitoring the data base so that individual departments are made aware of their students' status. Feedback from the departments or programs of Curriculum and Instruction, Social Science, Foreign Languages, English, Special Education, Biology, Earth Science, Child Development, Home Economics, Physical Science and Chemistry have been received. Each of these departments or programs has made contact with its At-Risk students and is working on individual case basis.

In addition to the AT-RISK information, TEAC is currently providing specific information to individual departments for use in the advisement and counseling of students. Demographic trends of teacher education classes, at both elementary and secondary levels, have been tallied, analyzed and distributed in order to help in load assessment, needs assessment, future planning for program adjustment, and personnel management. The use of TEAC survey data has been helpful to individual departments for program revision and course development, and to the University, so that it can look at the whole picture rather than fragmented pieces.

TEAC is also providing information that will be directly used for an upcoming NCATE, North Central, and The State of Missouri accreditation assessments. The tallies and survey results have been shared with the appropriate writing committees for the accreditation reports.

TEAC is not the "Watch Dog" of teacher education. TEAC is a centralized system of data collection and assessment that disseminates relevant data on a frequent and timely basis so that CMSU's dynamic system of teacher education is preparing professionals for the future.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES

TEAC members made two presentations of a paper entitled "Evaluation and Dissemination: A Dynamic System to Keep Teacher Education Meaningful" at the 1990 Association of Teacher Educators National Convention in Las Vegas, Nevada, and at the 1990 National Convention of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education in Chicago, Illinois.

TEAC is currently working on its next set of surveys and will begin collection of data in October of 1990. All data collection will conclude by March of 1991. The same format that was employed during the past two Follow-Up Study's will be used and a report will be given to the CMSU Teacher Education Council by September of 1991.

TEAC is deeply indebted to Dean Joe Huber for his encouragement and financial support for the projects that have occurred and are planned.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Academic advisement at the University and Departmental levels, needs to be addressed so that students are more positive about their experiences during and upon leaving the CMSU campus.

ACT and CAT composite scores need to be updated to the CMSU tapes--previously recommended in the 1989 Follow-Up Study.

The whole process of Teacher Certification and the number of hours necessary to complete secondary, elementary, and special education certification needs to be evaluated as soon as possible.

The employers of CMSU graduates are very satisfied with the teachers we have trained and would rehire them again if they were given the chance.

The teachers and student teachers have enjoyed their field experiences and desire more of such experiences.

More males need to be recruited into Elementary Education programs.

More minorities need to be recruited into Teacher Education as a whole.

Teacher Education courses need to address the concerns of classroom management, motivation, learning differentiation amongst students, and computer use and classroom application not only from a theoretical viewpoint but, most importantly, from a hands-on approach through field experience application.

Tests and measurements should be reinstated as part of the Elementary Curriculum.

The typical CMSU student completes 13-15 hours of course work per semester. At that rate of completion students will not complete a program in "4 years". Better advisement is needed to address this concern along with more financial aid to assist students in their quests.

Transfer students are spending approximately 8 semesters on the CMSU campus in addition to the 40 hours of transfer work they bring to this campus towards their degrees. There is a need for greater articulation between Missouri's four-year and two-year institutions to coordinate programs and requirements.

There are some programs where student average 150 semester hours or more in order to complete a degree. A complete examination of these programs should take place immediately to understand why these programs far exceed typical four year degree programs in student hour production.

The 26 programs that have graduated 12 or less students per program during the past 6 years need to be examined for their cost effectiveness to the University and their need to the State of Missouri.

Follow-up studies and exit interviews need to be completed with respect to <u>all</u> students who attend CMSU, whether they have graduated or not.

SURVEYS

TEAC Faculty Survey

The TEAC faculty survey was sent to each of the 152 members of the Professional Education Faculty (PEF) in November, 1989. The results of this survey included all responses from a total of 31 PEF members who made numerous comments. These comments ranged from suggestions for further data comparisons to program and course revisions to suggestions for improving the teacher education student selection criteria. There was a strong theme of assessment in the comments: assessment of courses, teaching style, writing, loads and load credits, students and funding. There was also a theme relating to the consolidation and reorganization of professional education courses and field experiences. Finally, many recommended that there be improvement in the advising process for students at both the academic advisor and department level.

DATE: November 9, 1989

TO: All members of the Professional Education Faculty

FROM: John R. Zelazek, Chairman
Teacher Education Assessment Committee

RE: PEF Survey--Teacher Education Program Assessment

We are in our second year of Teacher Education Assessment and would ask that you take a few minutes to address the concerns, both positive and negative, you have about the elementary and/or secondary teacher education programs. Some areas that you might address could be: length of program (total hours), writing assignments within the classes, what would you retain in the current teacher education programs?, what would you delete?, what would you add?, or any other constructive items you see fit to acknowledge with respect to Teacher Education here at CMSU.

Please write your concerns, suggestions, comments on this sheet of paper and return it to me at your earliest conveyance. The data collected will be part of our 1990 Follow-Up Study which will be presented to the TEC. Thank you.

J. Zelazek, 300 Lovinger

The following responses were received from 152 surveys sent:

1. I have two observations to convey to you. The first pertains to the hours of credit assigned to Elem. Health Ed. (HEd. 3310). Currently, the assigned value is 2 hrs. credit. There is not enough time to adequately cover the subject matter and assignments for this class. I assure you, that the intent of this suggestion is not self-serving.

The second observation focuses on "advisement". I have many, too many first semester students enrolled in the "3000" level class. The students are not prepared/ready for the demands of the class and the standards of the instructor.

2. Writing a philosophy paper in Foundations class--seen as a waste of students' and professors' time: they can't write a paper properly--copy directly from text--copy from each other. Students need to be exposed to how to write a lesson plan -- develop a unit. Early--rather than getting in each class. Might be included in Foundations?? Students need more field experiences attached to subject prior to student teaching. This is especially true for secondary and special ed! Add somewhere -- teacher empowerment. How to be assertive--how to interact with parents. Like text for Foundations--The increase in field exp. in reading. Students need more in-depth study of classroom management. This needs to be a separate course! Full semester student teaching for all with split assignments

3. There is good reason to believe that current education progress (i.e. hrs in education) is encompassing a disproportionate amount of student time. It sorely needs to be reduced. There needs to be more emphasis on methods in courses where content is taught (in the mathematics program/Science program). Some education courses need consolidating, some eliminated. There is too much splintering of ideas into several courses. I don't harbor any great expectations in this matter. Not many are will to "dissolve

their own expire" But there are signs of a force moving in this direction (e.g. look at the changes under way in State of Texas). In any event, I respect the courage shown when this issue (i.e. changes in education programs are considered). I just wonder if it has any real depth or sincerity---

4. I would like to see, in the next 5 years: Special methods courses in major fields taught by persons who have worked, even briefly (within 5 years), with secondary students in a regular classroom. (Several national organizations are working toward this goal.) Methods courses to be actual methods courses and not merely another chance to cram subject matter into students. Professional educators who teach prospective teachers on a regular basis to show evidence that they qualify for PEF. Anyone who teachers courses for prospective teachers (including subject matter) be involved with students in field, accompany students occasionally to classroom observations during professional semester, work with in-service teachers, and attend professional subject matter AND educational meetings off campus.

5. Require more content courses in major field for both Elementary and Secondary Education. Reduce number of hours of Professional Education to 20 hours for Secondary Teacher Education degree. Recommend the retention of the following in secondary teacher Education program:

EDCI 2100 Foundation of Education	3 hrs.
(include Secondary Field Experience I in EDCI 2100	
EDCI 4300 Educ. Meas. & Eval.	2 hrs.
EDCI 4500 Sec. Teaching & Beh. Mgt.	3 hrs.
EDCI 4520 Sec. Field Exp. II	1 hrs.
EDCI 4595 Stu. Tchg., Sec. I	5 hrs.
EDCI 4596 Stu. Tchg., Sec. II	4 hrs.
Special Methods in major field	2 hrs.
	20 hrs.

Delete rest of courses. Elementary Education Students should be required to declare a major field of study in a subject matter discipline. Elementary Education students should have the same requirements and options in General Education as other students.

6. More emphasis on content in major area (area in which student is to be certified). More practical experience, i.e., learning in a classroom setting with supervision. Could use videotaped simulations of classroom crises. etc. and have student react to them as to how they would handle it. Then they could be given feedback on how they performed. Then repeat with different scenarios.

7. The general education part--intro. courses etc. have improved greatly over time. In our specialty area. Business, we really need more in the Special Methods area-- I feel the program is good & don't have any recommendations of a change.

8. We need a FULL SEMESTER Special Methods class in modern Languages.

9. Enclosed, please find a tally and summary from my section of the EDCI 1150 field trip which was completed this date. Although this is not a complete report, I believe it is indicative of the quality and positive aspects of this educational activity. Note the number in ( ) indicates the number of students who gave this or a similar response. The field trip was well organized 5 (26), 4 (2) I was made to feel welcome at the school. 5 (27), 4(2) The field trip provided insights into the public school. 5 (21), 4(5), 3(3) The field trip provided practical, in-classroom learning experiences for me.5 (21), 4 (5), 3 (3) Additional field trips should be included in the EDCI 1150 class 5(15), 4(18), 3(5) I would be willing to pay reasonable transportation costs for additional field trips 5(6), 4(11), 3(7), 2(3) I would like for elementary students and/or teachers to be guest speakers in the EDCI 1150 classes on campus. 5(12), 4(15), 3(1) Liked BEST Participation (4); Seeing hands-on teaching (9); First hand insight to teaching (8); overview of whole school program (5) Liked least: not enough time in classrooms (14); Tour of custodial, office and nurse facilities; Day was too long; School lunch; standing and walking; stayed too long in some classrooms; did

not get to talk with students enough (3); would liked to have had time to go to areas of interest--for example, I would liked to have returned to the art center for further observation.

10. Teach strategies, Hunter model prior to methods courses so they can apply them. Change Educational Evaluation back to a requirement. Teachers must be knowledgeable about tests and interpretation of standardized tests. Stress writing in every course and oral presentations --poise, eye-contact. Maybe video feedback earlier. Visit student teachers during first week out not to "supervise" but to support.

11. I have a major concern that we do not do a better job of screening in terms of the criteria for entering - i.e. ACT of 18 and 2.5 GPA and advise out those who obviously do not, and will not ever, meet these criteria. Stop trying ways for students to circumvent the system. We have enough low ability teachers out there now!

12. I am too far removed from the elementary or secondary programs to be able to give any constructive comments as to what need be added, deleted developed etc.! I only teach Psy 5200 in summer session every year, so that really is my only contact with teachers and teacher education.

13. I have been pleased with the progress of our teacher education programs. Thanks for your assessment efforts.

14. I am not part of the "core" PEF and consequently do not have detailed knowledge of the programs, however, I certainly do feel that we should retain our teacher education programs. The education students in my Psychology of Exceptional Children class appear highly motivated and committed. I think our teacher education programs are doing a good job.

15. Secondary: Needs more field experiences, Computer literacy? Adolescent psy? Acknowledge we will eventually have to go beyond 124 hrs. Some majors way beyond state requirements. Elementary: Articulate curriculum to eliminate 2 hr. courses where appropriate.

16. Judging from the success of our majors, it appears that the teacher education programs have been very effective. The number of hours in professional education is of concern to us! I realize we have to meet state requirements, but the number of hours required continues to rise!! Of greater concern is the fact that revisions in the professional education requirements are sent to College Committees for approval prior to any consultation with the departments involved. This practice does not build a great deal of trust or support.

17. Need to have more exposure to Teaching children/student in real classroom situations... more practical experience.. need more teaching in front of peers rather than video taping of teaching. Need more field trips to school. i.e., trip to 1A, 2A, 3A, 4A, inter-city, upper class schools so comparing can be made in each situation. Overall less classroom experience at University and more in Public schools.

18. Do something to beef up your graduate program. You have graduated some people who are illiterate. I know, I've had some of them in class. Don't be afraid to set some minimal standards.

19. Opportunities needed to strengthen presentation composure of secondary majors. Need to strengthen adolescent psych. background of secondary majors. Will the new University studies be so inflexible that the elementary education program will be damaged?

20. I like the amount of time education majors spend in the classroom observing before they student teach. Many music education majors complain to me that some of the education courses they are required to take don't apply to their situation (i.e., running a rehearsal). Would it be possible to consider eliminating some education classes for music education majors in favor of some courses that would more directly benefit them, such as advanced conducting, choral literature, etc.? Classroom management and planning

are not quite the same for music teachers as for teachers of other subjects.

21. Field Experience Evaluation forms: prepare a return addressed/stamped envelope for completion and return directly to the course instructor. Test remediation results be returned directly from the testing center to the department for placement in student file. Elimination of giving U grade in Foundations of Education due to lack of completion of test remediation. Simply do not allow the student full-admission until providing evidence of successful compliance. Secondary Majors: The need for faculty names for student referral as per preparation for four year program. Field experience evaluation forms do not permit the student to view the results of their completed evaluation form. Knowing the student will be viewing the form could cause the teacher to not provide as much constructive criticism. This would still allow the instructor to communicate to the student their strengths/weaknesses as the teacher viewed such.

22. There needs to be some standardization of the graduate programs with some guideline for specialized programs in computers and early childhood. The methodology classes should be reorganized so that there is a single course to introduce teaching methodology and specialized courses in how to use that methodology in specific content areas. The methodology course could be added to the sophomore block in place of ed psych. and then the student could practice some of the methods during the field experience. There needs to be more C/I influence in the education courses for secondary majors. They also need a generic methodology course to go along with content. The measurement and evaluation course needs to be put back into the program for elementary and early childhood majors. There should also be a specific place for discipline other than in 4400 and 4500. We need to stress critical writing in more classes . Papers need to be assessed on the ability to use the information reported rather than just summarizing other people's information. Papers need to answer the question "So what?"

23. I believe teacher preparation should be a 4 and a half to 5 year program. Why are only writing assignments asked about above? What about oral communication skills? I believe every MA/MS program should have written comprehensive examinations and a solid, separate research requirement. Taking required and elective courses to total 32 hours does not guarantee a mastery of any content. Even elementary and secondary MA/MS people at CMSU joke about this. Sure there is much more work for faculty, but we either grant a master's degree or 32 more hours of course work.

24. 2 hrs. for special methods not enough. 6 weeks concentrated on special methods, too much too quick, students have difficulty digesting the materials. Not enough core in selecting teachers for Field Experience II, too haphazard. Some teachers are not good models. More care needed in selecting teacher under who students will practice teach for Field Experience II and for student teaching, students have too much say in where they will participate. Secondary ed. people in social studies have too few subject matter courses. I fear when the NTE is used that CMSU students, as a whole, will not do well. Select multi-cultural course more carefully for teacher ed. students. The course should focus on the non-western world, the non-Judeo-Christian framework.

25. In my opinion, teacher education in specific disciplines in the sciences could and should be improved significantly. Generally, state certification requirements specify a minimum of 20 semester hours in the discipline; whereas, a non-teaching major requires significantly more credit. Also, some courses satisfying teacher certification requirements are less rigorous than those for other degrees. At best, course requirements in a discipline are significantly less than professional education course requirements. A specific science discipline is too complex to expect quality teaching after completing the specified program. In actual practice, the situation is much worse. Public school officials readily utilize teachers in disciplines for which they have much less experience than specified minimal requirements. For example, it is very common for teachers certified in biology to be expected to teach chemistry or physics simply because they have a course or two. I suspect that such practices frequently cause more harm than good, i.e., confusion and student "turn-off" surely occur. If there is to be true assessment of programs, I believe the primary effort will have to be directed toward the evaluation of the product of the teachers' efforts by discipline, i.e., the student ' competence. After having collected that information, it should then be possible to establish effective guidelines and program requirements.

26. I believe a longer program is needed particularly in music where they need teaching experience at two levels and secondary especially are so pressed for performances that students don't have much time with the high school groups. I would like to see lesson plans required in all classes and scripting or some other form of evaluation used regularly by cooperating teacher (These could possibly be shared with the college supervisor also they often tell you one thing and write down something else on the final evaluation form) to show student progress. Public school teachers would probably need some instruction here. A possible idea: If the program is longer would be to have the student teachers back on campus 1 day every two weeks for group and special area meeting ?? Another idea: All cooperating teachers and principals be required to attend a meeting here or at their school with the college supervisor to go over the student teacher program. I know there is a meeting but most don't show. The luncheon thing didn't work too well, they took off or didn't come.

27. Thank you for your invitation to comment on the teacher education program. As a new member of the English Dept., I do not know enough about the program to make many specific comments. But I would like to share with you some concerns I have about the preparation of the students in my sections of ENG 3030 (Composition and Evaluation) and ENG 4040 (Composition and Rhetoric). None of these students--- juniors and seniors --- appear to have been taught analytic writing or persuasive writing. None of then know how to formulate a problem, demonstrate its existence and severity, analyze its causes and effects, and propose and defend a solution. None of them know how to write a persuasive evaluation addressed to their peers/professional peers-to-be. Apparently the only writing they've done in school has been expressive (What I think about X") and descriptive (summaries, for example). I am concerned that students who have never been taught to think analytically and originally in prose will in their turn produce students who do not think. I am concerned that self-expression passes for thought and that these students are now bringing a "fill-in-the-blanks" approach to classes where they are asked to design assignments and construct rationales for them, evaluate textbooks, and discuss professional issues. I am also concerned about the seeming inability of my 3030 students to relate to the children whom they will be teaching. The specific incident that triggered this concern was this : In the course of a class discussion, someone asked how a particular method could be used with junior high students. I've never taught junior high, so I added the class if they had taken education psychology. They all said "yes". But when I asked, " OK, what did you learn about the emotional and social needs of seventh graders?" they said, "Nothing" This incident suggests a lack of integration in the program. One would like one's students to learn material that they can apply to future situations. I can teach writing, but I cannot supply the educational/psychological conceptual framework that 3030 students should bring to the course. I am also concerned that students seem to receive their only formal training in analytic writing in literary criticism. Such writing certainly offers many benefits, notably critical reading skills and the ability to use specific data to develop and prove a claim. But it is not the most useful kind of writing for most teachers to learn because it's not what their students need or want or will be doing. American business and industry needs people who can think logically, analytically, and persuasively about a formidable array to topics and issues. I would like to see the education of our teachers oriented more towards "real-world" writing. To summarize, I would like to see our education majors taught to think and write more analytically, more persuasively, more critically, so that they will feel ready to teach their students to do the same . I guess I would basically like for us all to assume that we are dealing with intelligent students, to appeal to and stimulate them more than we are doing, and to prepare them to make the same assumptions and the same demands on their students.

28. I believe that a full semester of student teaching is needed - <u>essential</u> for K-12 students.

29. In regard to your memo concerning the current Teacher Education Program, we have the following concerns:

1. Total number of hours within the program. Our program is accredited by the National Association of Schools of Art and Design, and as such, we attempt to meet their guidelines. Those guidelines state: "Liberal Arts" Degree. The liberal arts undergraduate education degree is the Bachelor of Arts or Bachelor of Science degree with a major in visual art and art education. Based upon a 120 semester hour model, approximately 35-40% of the credit requirements should be in art and design courses, including twelve to

fifteen semester hours of art history; 15-20% in educational theory, methods, and practice teaching; and 40-50% in general academic studies. We are presently getting ready to propose the degree program attached. You will notice that we cannot meet the above requirements due to the large number of hours required in Education Theory and Methods. Also note that this represents a cut in the number of art hours from what is presently required.

2. I would not attempt at this time to tell you which courses are the most beneficial for the prospective teacher, but I would indicate to you that the one course we get the most questions about the course's validity to art education is Education Measurement and Evaluation. I am enclosing for your information the results of an alumni survey which we are just now completing. While no questions were specifically asked about the professional education courses, we did get several comments that are pertinent to the questions you ask. Art Alumni Comments Pertinent to Professional Education: What would you change about your undergraduate experience if you could?

A. I would have earned classroom certification while achieving art education certification. B. General education courses that I won't use--like college algebra. Other commer's. A. I completed a graduate degree. Have attended State University in Missouri and Kansas and felt very good about art instruction compared to previous schools. Instructors that are real people and I could relate to made my choice for CMSU. Education classes in the Ed. Dept were dull, not motivating or particularly educational. Can see no relationship to actual teaching.

B. Every class I took in Lovinger was a waste of time. Great material to philosophize on, pondering, splitting hairs. But as far as practical--take it into the classroom? Give Me A BREAK! That stuff is for veteran teachers--ones who have time to try experimentation, watch for results. I studied those books--kept those notes--held to those ideals. I was set up for major disappointment. I don't have time for high thoughts. I don't have time for IEP's. I don't have time to construct a perfect "William's test"! I have six prep's every night. I have demo's to keep up---not to mention teachers's meetings at 3:30/photographing that wrecked bus for the superintendent's benefit. That list has to be in 2nd period--oh, have your professional assessment to me tomorrow. Concession is out of candy--300 lbs. of clay to wedge. Any my mainstreamed student just carved my table into firewood. I have students who can scarcely read--but I need to worry about synthesis? How does a university prepare anyone for this? Can you really teach "teaching"? I wonder. I think professional educators in the universities wandered somewhere back down the pike. The college of education must teach something, right? who cares if it's relevant, or applicable--lofty offices, lofty theories, lofty research and studies. I learned more the first week than any classroom ever gave me. I learned the hard-nose, down-to-earth, nuts-and-bolts--and I'm still learning them. I like what I'm doing--at present. But when I consider paying money (graduate money) for graduate classes in education--I shudder. I'm afraid I'd burst out laughing anytime someone mentioned tests/measurements or such not and such what. I don't see any justifiable worth on the "real world" level. Madeline Hunter works--when you don't have the nurse removing students--and half your class is gone for play practice? Football boys and cheerleaders are leaving early. But all in all--I use her steps with good results.

30. Concern: Teacher Preparation for Driver Education Instruction. Major/Minor dropped from CMSU Safety Department (Also from most major institutions in MO.) 54% of current DE Teachers in US will retire in next 5 years. CMSU, once a leader in traffic safety Education--now gone. I currently, will be or have taught as a special project--any person wanting or needing classes in Drivers Ed. or hours toward Missouri Teaching Certificate. Teacher Ed. in Driver Education needs re-vamped and offered--1st summers--then as needed during school year. There needs to be more discussion before writing.

31. Length of Program: We discussed over the phone last semester the notion that 28 hours was already a big bite out of a student's program; the issue arose when it was suggested by someone that because of some new recommendation or regulation that yet another three-hour course would have to be added. Coming from a state that certified me with 18 hours of Ed credit and a B.A. in the discipline (Pennsylvania--3 hours courses in Foundations, Tests and Measurements, Ed. Psych, and A-V Equipment, plus six hours for student teaching), I'd recommend that your TEAC consider reducing the number of hours. A few suggestions: both field experiences could become non-credit "labs" attached to 2100 and 4500, respectively; student teaching credit be for six instead of nine hours; other combinations might be possible, but should be left to you who teach them. Writing assignments: I do not know much about what written work is currently being required.

TEAC Graduate (First and Second Year Teacher) Survey

In compliance with the Missouri's Excellence in Education Act of 1985, CMSU solicits follow-up information concerning its first and second year Teacher Education graduates in addition to information from employers and supervisors of the graduates from CMSU's teacher education program. TEAC was able to secure the names, addresses, and schools of past first and second year teacher-certified graduates from the Office of Clinical Services. In the State of Missouri, local school districts are paid $100 per first and second year teacher that is reported in the appropriate process to the state. This is the key to the success of obtaining the list at the university level. A total of 241 first and second year teachers were listed based on the sets of demographic information received from their employers. Of the 241 sets of data, 215 were graduated between May, 1987 and August, 1989. A total of 16 teachers completed requirements between May, 1985 and the May, 1987. Another 11 individual teachers completed requirements between May, 1972 and May, 1985. Of the 241 teachers listed, 142 were designated as first year teachers and 99 were designated as second year teachers. A total of 78 teachers from this years' listing were also submitted as part of the 1989 TEAC data listings. A total of 147 return responses were received from the 241 sent, a 61% rate of return. The survey identified information concerning employment status, salary, graduate school plans, undergraduate training, and satisfaction levels. Finally each respondent was asked to identify goals of teaching.

Most first and second year teachers characterized themselves as better than average teachers and chose as their goal of teaching to promote academic achievement and to enhance personal development. The following six pages reflect the graduate, first and second year teacher, survey and all of the data that was compiled.

Central Missouri State University

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Warrensburg, MO 64093-5086
816-429-4235
FAX 1-816-747-1653

January, 1990

Dear Graduate,

On behalf of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, I would like to ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Enclosed is copy of our assessment instrument that I would like you to complete. Please return the survey to me in the stamped envelope by February 5, 1990.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), our national accreditation agency for teacher education, NCATE, and our regional accreditation agency, North Central. We need to conduct a follow-up of our recent graduates in our programs. This data will be used in conjunction with last year's survey, and surveys that are currently being distributed by individual departments on our campus (i.e., Curriculum and Instruction, Sociology, Special Services) for the purpose of improving our various programs.

I will also be contacting your principal to make him/her aware of our surveys, and ask him/her to participate in an employers' survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in our joint quest for Excellence in Teacher Education.

Sincerely,

Dr. John R. Zelazek
Chairman of TEAC

Faculties of Children's Literature, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education, Foundations of Education, Language Arts, Reading, Science Education and Secondary Education

EQUAL EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. (TEAC-GRADUATE--SPRING-1990)

1. Gender: (31) male (114) female

2. Age: _26_ years

3. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

(80) single (58) married (4) widowed, separated, or divorced

4. What was your annual salary/income in the first teaching job you held after college?

(10) less than $10,000
(1) $10,000 - $12,999
(4) $13,000 - $15,999
(90) $16,000 - $18,999
(29) $19,000 - $21,999
(10) $22,000 - $24,999
(1) $25,000 - $27,999
(0) $28,000 or beyond

5. How would you describe yourself?

(4) American Indian, or Alaskan Native
(0) Asian or Pacific Islander
(2) Black, non-Hispanic
(2) Hispanic
(137) White,non-Hispanic
(0) Other (please specify) _____

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

(128) full-time student (7) sometimes full-time/sometimes parttime (3) part-time student

7. When did you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

(5) fall 1985 to summer 1986
(11) fall 1986 to summer 1987
(48) fall 1987 to summer 1988
(71) fall 1988 to summer 1989
(9) other _____

8. How many children do you have?

(103) zero (21) one (16) two (4) three (0) more than three

9. Do you plan to do your graduate work in education?

(114) Yes (22) Not Sure (8) No

10. Do you plan to do your graduate work at CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY?

(69) Yes (60) Not Sure (14) No

11. Which of the following provides the best description of the kind of work you currently do?

(141) classroom teacher
(0) teacher/trainer in a non-school setting
(0) in education, but not teaching
(1) provide social services
(0) self-employed
(0) student
(0) homemaker
(0) temporarily laid off/unemployed
(1) other

If you checked **classroom teacher** or **in education but not teaching** above, please skip to **Part B #17.** If not, please answer Part A, then skip to **GENERAL INDICES #26**

PART A (Nonteachers)

12. Why aren't you teaching at the present time?

(0) teaching was not my first choice of careers at the time I began looking for a job
(0) a teaching position was not available in the geographical area where I hoped to reside
(0) I tried, but couldn't find a teaching position anywhere
(0) I was offered a more rewarding job within the field of education (e.g., school administrator)
(0) I was offered a better job outside of education
(0) I wanted to continue my education
(0) I needed to attend to home/family affairs
(0) other (please specify) _____

13. Do you wish you were teaching?

(0) Yes (0) No

14. If you are currently employed, do you feel you are under-employed?

(0) Yes (0) No

15. What are your employment plans for next year?

(0) remain in current job
(0) try to find a job as a teacher
(0) try to find some other job in education
(0) change to a different job that is not in education
(0) leave the work force temporarily (e.g. to care for a family)
(0) leave the work force permanently
(0) undecided
(0) other (specify) _____

16. To what extent did the work you completed in your teacher education program, (this includes field experiences and content classes, and student teaching) contribute to your level of preparation for your current job?

(0) strong contribution (0) moderate contribution (0) minor contribution (0) no contribution

PART B TEACHERS

17. How would you describe your current position in education?

(133) full-time teacher
(3) permanent substitute
(4) part-time teacher
(0) day to day substitute teacher
(1) education specialist (e.g., math coordinator, librarian)
(0) school administrator/supervisor
(1) other

If you are a full-time teacher or permanent sub, please continue. All others, skip to Section III.

18. At what grade level do you teach?

(11) preschool/kindergarten
(25) early elementary/grades 1-3
(19) upper elementary/grades 4-6
(28) middle school/jr. high
(32) senior high school
(24) more than one level/k-12

19. Is this the level at which you prefer to teach?

(115) Yes (14) No

20. (a) What subject(s) do you teach? (check all that apply)

__5_Agriculture	__4_Home Economics
_10_Art	_26_History
_15_Biology	__3_Industrial Tech/Voc.Ed.
__3_Business	__1_Journalism
__5_Chemistry	_25_Mathematics
_11_Civics/Government	_10_Music
__8_Computer Science	__6_Physical Education
__2_Distributive Ed/Marketing	__6_Physical Sciences/Physics
_16_Earth Science	_11_Pre K-3
_45_Elementary	_15_Reading
_26_English/Language Arts	_10_Social Sciences/Psychology
__4_Foreign Language	_18_Special Education
_21_General Science	__0_Speech/Theatre
_15_Health	_14_Other_____

(b) What was your undergraduate major? Of the 147 responses: 33% Elementary Education, 10% Special Education, 8% English, all other majors were less than 5%.

21. About what percent of your present teaching assignment is in the grade(s) or subject area(s) in which you were certified/endorsed. (116) 100% (7) 75% (9) 50% (6) 25% or less

22. For how long have you been teaching full time?

(90) less than one year (5) 2 to 3 years
(44) 1 to 2 years (0) more than 3 years

23. Five years from now, do you plan to be

(116) teaching
(5) an educational specialist (e.g., math consultant, curriculum developer)
(5) a school administrator
(5) employed outside the field of education
(5) temporarily out of the work force (e.g., to care for a family, to continue your education)
(0) permanently out of the work force
(3) other

24. How much longer do you expect to teach?

(9) less than five years (29) 5-10 years (44) 11-20 years (56) more than 20 years

25. During the past year, have you been employed in some capacity other than your regular teaching assignment?

(51) No If Yes, how would you describe your other source(s) of income? (check all that apply)

(31) coaching
(26) other school-related assignments during the school year
(15) employment outside the school system during the school year
(13) school-related job during the summer
(43) employment outside the school system during the summer

GENERAL INDICES

26. If you had it to do over again, would you still enroll in a teacher preparation program?

(79) definitely yes (7) probably not
(54) probably yes (2) definitely not

27. Please rate your level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of your current positions.

KEY: 1 = very satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neutral; 4 = dissatisfied; 5 = very dissatisfied

_2.5__ salary/fringe benefits
_1.9__ quality/level of administrative support
_1.9__ level of personal/professional challenge
_2.1__ methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
_1.9__ your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion
_2.6__ general work conditions (hours, work load, class size)
_2.1__ intellectual stimulation of the workplace
_2.0__ geographical location
_2.5__ opportunities for professional advancement
_2.4__ level of support from parents and the community
_1.9__ level of support from administrators and colleagues
_1.9__ interactions with colleagues
_1.7__ interactions with students

28. Do you plan to transfer to a different school or to look for a different job next year?

(78) No (50) Possibly (17) Yes

29. To what extent have education courses (other than field-base experiences such as student teaching) contributed to your success as a teacher?

These courses have made a(n) _____ contribution to my success.

(18) very significant (42) significant (65) moderate (16) insignificant

30. At the time you completed your teacher preparation program, how would you have rated the adequacy of your preparation to teach in a culturally diverse setting with **at-risk** students?

(32) very weak (54) weak (39) adequate (18) strong (1) very strong

31. Did you major in education as an undergraduate?

(129) Yes

If No, to what extent were non-education courses in your major adapted to the needs of teachers?

Were these courses ...
(5) well adapted to the needs of teachers
(12) moderately relevant
(6) largely irrelevant

32. Do you feel you are a(n) ...

(16) exceptional teacher (1) below average teacher
(91) better than average teacher (0) inferior teacher
(35) average teacher

33. Generally you are viewed by others as a(n)...

(18) exceptional teacher (0) below average teacher
(86) better than average teacher (0) inferior teacher
(38) average teacher

General goals of schooling include:

Promoting academic development (e.g., gaining academic knowledge & understanding; developing critical thinking and problem solving skills)

Enhancing personal development (e.g., learning to cope with emotional stress; developing a sense of dignity and self-worth)

Facilitating social development (e.g., learning to get along with others; developing and appreciation for one's own and other cultures)

34. In thinking about your own goals as a teacher, does one of these stand out as clearly more important than the others?

(54) No If Yes, which one?

(39) promoting academic achievement
(38) enhancing personal development
(13) facilitating social development

35. In thinking about your own goals as a teacher, does one of these stand out as clearly less important than the others?

(106) No If Yes, which one?

(8) promoting academic achievement
(13) enhancing personal development
(13) facilitating social development

TEAC Employer Survey

TEAC secured the names, addresses, and schools of the 186 principals who were the immediate supervisors of the 241 first and second year teachers as described in the previous section. A total of 118 survey responses were received for a 63% return rate. Those 118 principals employed 174 of the 241 first and second year teachers listed in this years data base. The questions to the administrators repeated many of the questions to the teachers. The administrators were asked about their perceptions of the teachers' employment status, salary, graduate school plans, undergraduate training, and satisfaction levels. They were asked if they would rehire these teachers and most said they would. When asked about themselves, the principals characterized themselves as better than average administrators and claimed that others viewed them as better than average. When asked about their goals, when stating a preferred goal, they felt that promoting academic achievement should be the primary goal of education. This was a change from the previous survey which indicated that principals felt that enhancing personal development was most important. The following five pages reflects the results of the employer survey and all of the data compiled.

Central Missouri State University

Department of Curriculum and Instruction
Warrensburg, MO 64093-5086
816-429-4235
FAX 1-816-747-1653

January, 1990

Dear Principal,

On behalf of the Teacher Education Assessment Committee (TEAC) at Central Missouri State University, I would like to ask your assistance in the assessment process we are currently undertaking. Enclosed is copy of our assessment instrument that I would like you to complete. Please return the survey to me in the stamped envelope by February 5, 1990.

This task is in compliance with The State of Missouri law (Excellence in Education Act of 1985), our national accreditation agency for teacher education, NCATE, and our regional accreditation agency, North Central. We need to conduct a follow-up of employers of our recent graduates from our programs. This data will be used in conjunction with last year's survey, and surveys that are currently being distributed by individual departments on our campus (i.e., Curriculum and Instruction, Sociology, Special Services) for the purpose of improving our various programs.

I will also be contacting your teachers, who are our graduates of our programs, to make them aware of our surveys and ask them to participate in a graduate survey. All responses will be confidential. If you wish a copy of our results, please enclose a self-addressed stamped envelope, and I will send you a copy as soon as they are compiled.

Thank you for your time and cooperation in our joint quest for Excellence in Teacher Education.

Sincerely,

Dr. John R. Zelazek
Chairman of TEAC

Faculties of Children's Literature, Early Childhood Education, Elementary Education
Foundations of Education, Language Arts, Reading, Science Education and Secondary Education
EQUAL EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. **(TEAC--EMPLOYER-1990)**

1. How many CMSU graduates did you employ this school year as first or second year teachers? _174_

   Gender: males_36__ females_138__

2. What is their annual individual salary on average?

   (7) less than $18,000
   (89) $18,000 - $19,999
   (8) $20,000 - $21,999
   (3) $22,000 - $23,999
   (0) $24,000 or beyond

3. How would you describe them? Please list a number for each.

   (4) American Indian, or Alaskan Native (2) Hispanic
   (1) Asian or Pacific Islander (161) White, non-Hispanic
   (3) Black, non-Hispanic (3) Other (please specify) _____

4. Do they plan to do graduate work in education? Please give a number for each choice.

   (97) Yes (51) Not Sure (8) No

5. Do they plan to do graduate work at CENTRAL MISSOURI STATE UNIVERSITY? Please give a number for each choice.

   (57) Yes (95) Not Sure (9) No

6. Do they regret they are teachers? Please give a number for each choice.

   (16) Yes (150) No

7. How well prepared do you consider them for their present position?

   (32) Very strong (58) strong (14) adequate (2) weak (0) very weak

8. How would you describe their current positions in education? Please list numbers for each position.

(154) full-time teacher
(9) permanent substitute
(4) part-time teacher
(1) day to day substitute teacher
(0) education specialist (e.g., math coordinator, curriculum developer)
(0) school administrator/supervisor
(1) other_____

9. What subject(s) do they teach? (please list numbers for all that apply)

_2___Agriculture	__3__ Home Economics
_3___Art	__4__ History
_6___Biology	__4__Industrial Tech/Voc.Ed.
_1___Business	__3__Journalism
_1___Chemistry	__9__Mathematics
_3___Civics/Government	__9__Music
_0___Computer Science	__6__Physical Education
_2___Distributive Ed/Marketing	__5__Physical Sciences/Physics
_4___Earth Science	__7__Pre K-3
_63__Elementary	__1__Reading
_11__English/Language Arts	__1__Social Sciences/Psychology
__7__Foreign Language	_18__Special Education
__2__General Science	__0__Speech/Theatre
__0__Health	_15__Other_____

10. Are any of your first or second year teachers teaching in areas in which they are not certified or endorsed?

(99) All are certified (4) 1-25% (2) 26-50% (1) 51-75% (0) 76 -100%

11. How much longer do you expect them to teach in their present location and assignment (on average)?

(53) less than five years (33) 5-10 years (7) 11-20 years (6) more than 20 years

12. If you had it to do over again, would you still hire these teachers? Please list a number by each response.

(144) all (13) some (6) most (5) none of these

13. Please rate your perception of your new teachers' level of satisfaction with each of the following aspects of their current teaching positions.

KEY

1 = very satisfied; 2 = satisfied; 3 = neutral; 4 = dissatisfied; 5 = very dissatisfied

_2.2___1. salary/fringe benefits
_1.8___2. quality/level of administrative support
_1.7___3. level of personal/professional challenge
_2.3___4. methods used to evaluate your teaching performance
_1.8___5. your sense of professional autonomy/level of discretion
_1.9___6. general work conditions (hours, work load, class size)
_1.8___7. intellectual stimulation of the workplace
_2.0___8. geographical location
_2.3___9. opportunities for professional advancement
_2.3___10. level of support from parents and the community
_1.6___11. level of support from administrators and colleagues
_1.6___12. interactions with colleagues
_1.7___13. interactions with students

14. To what extent have education courses (other than field-based experiences such as student teaching) contributed to their success as a teacher? Please list numbers for each choice.

(8) critical (113) significant (44) modest (5)insignificant

ABOUT YOU

15. At the time **you** completed your teacher preparation program (YEAR _1970_, how would you have rated the adequacy of your preparation to teach in a culturally diverse setting with at-risk students?

(3) very strong (19) strong (24) adequate (53) weak (13) very weak

16. Did you major in education as an undergraduate?

(10) Yes

If No, to what extent were non-education courses in your major adapted to the needs of teachers? Were these courses ...

(3) well adapted to the needs of teachers
(9) moderately relevant
(9) largely irrelevant

17. Do you feel you are a(n) ...

(17) exceptional administrator
(85) better than average administrator
(7) average administrator
(0) below average administrator
(0) inferior administrator

18. Others overall, view me as a(n)...

(20) exceptional administrator
(82) better than average administrator
(5) average administrator
(1) below average administrator
(0) inferior administrator

General goals of schooling include:

Promoting academic development (e.g., gaining academic knowledge & understanding; developing critical thinking and problem solving skills)

Enhancing personal development (e.g., learning to cope with emotional stress; developing a sense of dignity and self-worth)

Facilitating social development (e.g., learning to get along with others; developing and appreciation for one's own and other cultures)

19. In thinking about your own goals as an administrator, does one of these stand out as clearly more important than the others?

(54) No If Yes, which one?

(41) promoting academic achievement
(13) enhancing personal development
(2) facilitating social development

20. In thinking about your own goals as an administrator, does one of these stand out as clearly less important than the others?

(87) No If Yes, which one?

(6) promoting academic achievement
(7) enhancing personal development
(9) facilitating social development

TEAC Student Teacher Survey

TEAC surveyed the 1989 Fall and the 1990 Spring student teachers during their evaluation conferences on the CMSU campus. A total of 273 of the 318 student teachers responded for an 86% response rate. The average age for the student teachers was 26.3 years. This indicates a large number of non-traditional students preparing to student teach. This may have had an impact on the information collected. In comparison with the student teachers' report of last year, the average age dropped from 27.0 years old. There was also a decrease in the percentage of students who are single but no increase in the number without children. The data reflects that 54% of the students were single and 72 % had no children. The student teachers rated their programs and compared general education courses to teacher education courses. The also thought that the quality of their undergraduate major and undergraduate minor courses were stronger than their liberal art/general education courses. The student gave the lowest ratings to their academic advisors and minor advisors. Other questions addressed their student teaching experience and the relationship with their cooperating teachers. Approximately 80% of the students considered themselves better than average to excellent teachers. This is consistent with last year's data. The last section of the survey addressed an evaluation of specific aspects of teacher skills. The skill area that received the highest rating by the new teachers was their ability to establish working relations with colleagues and other professionals with whom they worked. The skill areas that were considered as problems or frustrations were: (1) responding appropriately to disruptive student behaviors; (2) motivating students to participate in academic tasks and; (3) diagnosing students' learning difficulties. The students also identified using computers in instruction and understanding and using standardized tests as their weakest skill areas. These strengths and weaknesses are also consistent with the data from last year. The following 6 pages are compilations of the data received from the student teachers.

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. **(TEAC--Student Teachers--1989-1990)**

1. Gender: (56) male (217) female

2. Age: __26.3____years

3. What was (will be) your marital status at the time you complete certification?

   (148) single
   (108) married
   (16) widowed, separated, or divorced

4. How would you describe yourself?

   (7) American Indian, or Alaskan Native
   (0) Asian or Pacific Islander
   (2) Black, non-Hispanic
   (2) Hispanic
   (260) White, non-Hispanic
   (1) Other_____

5. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

   (253) full-time student
   (4) part-time student
   (11) sometimes full-time/ part-time

6. When will you complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

   (253) fall 1989 to summer 1990
   (4) fall 1990 to summer 1991
   (11) Other_____

7. How many children do you have?

   (199) zero
   (20) one
   (31) two
   (11) three
   (10) four or more

8. On a scale of one to seven, how would you rate the overall quality of:

	WEAK STRONG
5.0 your teacher preparation program	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.3 courses in your undergraduate major field	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.2 courses in your minor field (may not apply)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.5 the liberal arts/general education courses you have taken	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.2 your student teaching experience	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.7 advice/counseling you received from your departmental advisor (in your major field of study)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.9 (in your minor field of study)	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.0 advice/counseling you received from your academic advisor	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.5 support, assistance, and general help from faculty and staff in your teacher education program	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

9. How did the quality of the courses you were required to take in education compare with that of courses you were required to take in other areas? Was it _____ that of other required courses? Was it _____that of elective courses?

(20) far higher than (107) higher than (93) equal to(32) lower than (8) far lower than
(23) far higher than (111) higher than (98) equal to (24) lower than (5) far lower than

10. To what extent is your style of teaching consistent with that of your supervising/cooperating teacher (during student teaching)?

(58) very consistent (161) consistent (35) inconsistent (12) very inconsistent

11. To what extent did your views of the professional roles and responsibilities of teachers change from the time you entered your teacher education program to program completion?

(35) a lot (78) quite a bit (107) some (37) not much (8) not at all

12. To what extent have education courses (other than field-based experiences such as student teaching) contributed to your success as a teacher? These courses have made a(n) _____ contribution to my success.

(27) very significant (113) significant (112) moderate (17) insignificant

13. At the time you completed your teacher preparation program, how would you have rated the adequacy of your preparation to teach in a culturally diverse setting with **at-risk** students?

(24) very weak (109) weak (111) adequate (24) strong (4) very strong

14. Do you feel you are a(n) ...

(42) exceptional teacher
(173) better than average teacher
(54) average teacher
(0) below average teacher
(0) inferior teacher

This next section has two portions for each stem.

15. I. Rating of the adequacy of your teaching skills in this area?

WEAK=1 ADEQUATE=2 STRONG=3

II. What helped you most in developing this skill?

EDUCATION COURSES=EC, FIELD EXPERIENCE=FE, OTHER=O

CIRCLE one from each row for each question.

1 2 3 (a) plan stimulating and effective lessons.
EC FE O 2.3-134,94,46

1 2 3 (b) select, prepare and use educational media
EC FE O 2.2-151,66,56

1 2 3 (c) teach problem solving, conceptual understanding and other
EC FE O understanding, and other aspects of higher-order thinking
2.2-151,60.58

1 2 3 (d) enhance students' sense of personal achievement and self-worth
EC FE O 2.5-64,106,102

1 2 3 (e) motivate students to participate in academic tasks
EC FE O 2.3-79,119,74

1 2 3 (f) use computers in instruction
EC FE O 1.8-152,34,78

1 2 3 (g) understand and use standardized tests
EC FE O 1.9-194,34,31

1 2 3 (h) use community resources
EC FE O 2.1-113,59,94

1 2 3 (i) establish effective working relations with colleagues and
EC FE O other professionals with whom you work
2.6-25,111,135

1 2 3 (j) refer students for special assistance when appropriate
EC FE O 2.4-103,107,53

1 2 3 (k) assess and improve your own performance as a teacher
EC FE O 2.4-80,125,65

1 2 3 (l) account for, and build on, students cultural and academic
EC FE O diversity in the instruction you offer
2.1-105,106,51

1 2 3 (m) work with parents
EC FE O 2.1-52,122,81

1 2 3 (n) work with gifted and talented students
EC FE O 2.1-110,100,49

1 2 3 (o) work with mainstreamed or other special needs students
EC FE O 2.1-105,117,41

1 2 3 (p) adapt instruction and/or materials to address varying needs
EC FE O and achievements of individual student
2.2-101,114,49

1 2 3 (q) create a learning environment in which students function as
EC FE O responsible and autonomous learners
2.3-69,149,46

1 2 3 (r) make inferences about students' cognitive and metacognitive
EC FE O processes (i.e., the ways they think)
2.2-126,88,50

1 2 3 (s) respond appropriately to disruptive student behaviors
EC FE O 2.3-58,149,57

1 2 3 (t) teaching reading in your grade or subject area
EC FE O 2.1-135,86,33

1 2 3 (u) teaching writing in your grade or subject area
EC FE O 2.1-113,90,52

1 2 3 (v) recognize your strengths and limitations as a teacher
EC FE O 2.1-46,145,79

1 2 3 (w) design/interpret measures of student work and achievement
EC FE O 2.3-89,126,54

1 2 3 (x) monitor students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly
EC FE O 2.3-72,151,46

1 2 3 (y) diagnose students' learning difficulties
EC FE O 2.1-110,122,33

1 2 3 (z) plan and implement a successful first week of school
EC FE O 2.1-102,110,46

1 2 3 (aa) assess the expectations of the community and school
EC FE O administration (e.g., how teachers are likely to be judged)
2.3-66,136,63

1 2 3 (bb) develop and/or represent a given concept or idea
EC FE O in a variety of ways (alternative explanations, metaphors,
graphs, pictures, manipulatives)
2.4-117,107,43

1 2 3 (cc) maintain high expectations for student achievement
EC FE O 2.5-82,127,60

1 2 3 (dd) locate and use the professional literature in addressing
EC FE O problems or issues you encounter in teaching
2.2-140,75,51

16. Do any of the skills listed in Q. 15 represent areas in which you have experienced problems or frustrations in your student teaching assignment?

(96) No ( ) Yes -- Please identify the THREE areas that pose the most significant problems or frustrations. Write the letters corresponding to these areas here:

S = respond appropriately to distruptive student behaviors
E = motivate students to participate in academic tasks
Y = diagnose students' learning difficulties

17. How would you have rated the overall adequacy of your skills (Q.15) in each of the following areas at the time you completed your teacher preparation program:

(2) weak (155) adequate (97) strong

18. What helped you the most in the over all development of each skill (Q.15)

(53) courses in education
(142) field experiences in your teacher education program
(67) some other sources (e.g., personal experience)?

TEAC Foundations of Education Survey

TEAC surveyed all sections of the course Foundations of Education during the 1989-1990 school year. This course is at the sophomore level within the professional education block required for certification. A total of 477 students of a possible 530 responded to our survey for a 90% response rate. The students in these classes averaged 22.2 years of age, were mostly single, full-time students, and had no children. The only difference in the groups on these demographic comparisons is that last year the average age was 22.9 years. A total of 10% of the students were identified as post-bachelor students which is a growing cohort within the teacher education program at CMSU. When asked about the goals of education, these students (52%) responded almost identically to the first and second year teachers (53%) that promoting academic achievement and enhancing personal development are the goals of education.

PLEASE READ EACH STATEMENT, THEN CIRCLE, FILL-IN OR CHOOSE YOUR RESPONSE FOR EACH ITEM. **(TEAC--FOUNDATIONS--1990)**

Gender: 1. (127) male 2. (350) female 3. Age: _22.2_years

4. What was your marital status at the time you graduated from college?

Post-Bachelor Students Only.

(10) single (27) married (10) widowed, separated, or divorced

5. How would you describe yourself?

(19) American Indian, or Alaskan Native (2) Hispanic
(2) Asian or Pacific Islander (431) White, non-Hispanic
(18) Black, non-Hispanic (5) Other (please specify) _____

6. How would you characterize your status as an undergraduate?

(442) full-time student (9) part-time student (27) sometimes full-time/ part- time

7. When do you plan to complete all requirements of your teacher certification program?

(16) fall 1989 to summer 1990
(69) fall 1990 to summer 1991
(224) fall 1991 to summer 1992
(128) fall 1992 to summer 1993
(29) fall 1993 to summer1994
(7) other_____

8. How many children do you have?

(383) zero (30) one (35) two (11) three (8) four or more

9. How do you rate the adequacy of your knowledge and understanding in each of the following areas. Your knowledge and understanding of:

		weak	adequate	strong
1.98	mathematics	1	2	3
2.15	social sciences	1	2	3
2.02	natural sciences	1	2	3
2.23	humanities	1	2	3
1.86	multi-cultural issues and perspectives	1	2	3
1.62	non-Western philosophies and cultures	1	2	3

		weak	adequate	strong
2.23	American history and literature	1	2	3
2.28	the historical and philosophical development of thought in your major field of study	1	2	3
2.15	contemporary educational issues	1	2	3
2.09	theories/principles of how students learn	1	2	3
2.30	child/adolescent growth and development	1	2	3
2.00	social and political roles of schools in America	1	2	3
2.42	classroom management techniques procedures	1	2	3
2.03	legal and ethical responsibilities of teachers	1	2	3

10. Thinking in terms of your current role as a student, do you wish you had a stronger background in any of the areas of knowledge listed in Q. 9 above?

(65) No

(407) Yes -Please identify the THREE areas in which a stronger background would be most helpful. Write the letters corresponding to these areas here:

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, MATH, LEGAL AND ETHICAL RESPONSIBILITIES

11. Please list the FIVE areas of knowledge listed in Q. 9 above that you would rate as most essential to your current success in becoming a teacher:

CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT, MATH, THEORIES OF LEARNING, CHILD/ADOLESCENT GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT, SOCIAL AND POLITICAL ROLES OF SCHOOL IN AMERICAN SOCIETY.

GENERAL GOALS OF SCHOOLING INCLUDE:

Promoting academic development (e.g., gaining academic knowledge and understanding; developing critical thinking and problem solving skills)

Enhancing personal development (e.g., learning to cope with emotional stress; developing a sense of dignity and self-worth)

Facilitating social development (e.g., learning to get along with others; developing and appreciation for one's own and other cultures)

12. In thinking about your own goals as a teacher, does one of these stand out as clearly more important than the others?

(201) NO

If yes, which one?

(128) promoting academic achievement
(119) enhancing personal development
(21) facilitating social development

13. In thinking about your own goals as a student, does one of these stand out as clearly less important than the others?

(312) NO

If yes, which one?

(51) promoting academic achievement
(50) enhancing personal development
(57) facilitating social development

TEAC DATA BASE

The TEAC data base was devised in consultation with the CMSU Office of Institutional Research and Testing Services. The findings are based on an examination of the full 7,100 person data base by major categories as follows:

A COMPARISON OF ALL 1984 THROUGH 1989 BSE AND BME GRADUATES

A COMPARISON OF ALL 1984 THROUGH 1989 ELEMENTARY EDUCATION GRADUATES

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDUCATION GRADUATES 1984-1989

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 1150 STUDENTS 1987-1990

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 2100 STUDENTS, 1984-1989

C-BASE SCORE FOR ALL CMSU STUDENTS-4/88 THROUGH 3/90

PROGRAM RETENTION 1984 THOUGH 1989 BASED ON EDCI 2100 ENROLLMENT

A COMPARISON OF ALL 1984 THROUGH 1989 BSE AND BME GRADUATES

During the time period of August 1984 through December 1989, CMSU graduated 1306 BSE and BME candidates within 50 different majors. This does not include student who just received certification. The three Elementary Education majors which are designated as Elementary Education Functional, Early Childhood, and Elementary Education Middle School accounted for 45% of the graduates. A variety of Secondary Education programs accounted for 48% of the graduates and the remaining 7% of the populous completed their degree requirements in Special Education. Incoming average ACT composite scores for the population was 19.2 and only 93 "Regular CMSU" students completed their degree programs in 8 semesters. Graduates were viewed as **CMSU Regular**, meaning they completed all of their course work at CMSU, or as **Transfer students**, meaning they had at least one semester hour of transfer work as part of their degree program at CMSU. **Regular** graduates averaged 9.9 semesters of enrollment. A closer look at that data revealed that the Elementary students averaged 9.6 semesters, the secondary students 10.1 semesters, and the Special Education students 9.9 semesters to complete degree requirements. The **CMSU regular** students also averaged 141 hours for graduation. **Transfer** students on the other hand averaged 7.9 semesters of CMSU enrollment. A closer looked at that data revealed that Elementary students averaged 7.8 semesters, Secondary students 7.9 semesters and Special Education students 8.6 semesters. The typical transfer student brought in 40.2 hours and completed an additional 104.0 hours of credit at CMSU for a total of 145.1 hours for a degree. Students, whether **regular** or **transfer**, averaged below 14.5 hours of course load completed per semester with **regular** students averaging 14.3 and **transfers** 13.3 semester hours respectively. An explanation of all headings per category and all data follows through the next 10 pages of information.

COLUMN HEADING EXPLANATIONS:

MJR Code: Current CMSU major codes

MAJOR TITLES: Current CMSU major titles

Total (N): Total number of students graduated with a BSE or BME

ACT (N): Total number of ACT composite scores of education graduates upon entry into the university.

ACT COMP (x): Average ACT composite score of graduates upon entry into the university.

CMSU Reg (N): Total number of students who completed all of their degree work at CMSU.

Reg Sem (T): Total number of semesters of attendance by regular CMSU students.

Reg Sem (x): Average number of semesters a regular CMSU student completed for graduation.

"8 Sem" (N): Total number of regular students who completed their degree in 8 semesters.

Reg Hrs/Sem: Average number of hours completed per semester by a regular student.

Reg Deg Hrs (x): Average number of hours completed by a regular student for their degree.

Trans (N): Total number of transfer students who completed BSE or BME degrees (Note: A transfer student is defined as a student who transfers in one or more hours as part of their degree program at CMSU from a junior college, community college or another four year institution of higher learning.)

Trans Sem (T): Total number of semester enrolled by transfer students at CMSU.

Trans Sem (x): Average number of semesters enrolled by transfer students at CMSU in order to complete a BSE or BME degree.

Trans Hrs (T): Total number of hours accepted by CMSU for transfer students.

Trans Hrs (x): Average number of transfer hours accepted by CMSU per transfer student.

T-CMSU Hrs (T): Total number of CMSU hours completed by transfer students.

T-CMSU Hrs (x): Average number of CMSU semester hours completed per transfer student.

T-CMSU Hr/Sem: Average number of CMSU hours completed per semester per transfer student.

T-Deg Hrs (x): Average number of hours, transfer hours plus CMSU hours, required to graduate for a transfer student with a BSE or BME degree.

THE FOLLOWING SETS OF DATA REFLECT ALL BSE AND BME GRADUATES FROM THE SUMMER OF 1984 THROUGH THE FALL OF 1989.

POST BACHELOR STUDENTS ARE NOT INCLUDED IN THE FOLLOWING DATA BECAUSE THEY USUALLY ONLY COMPLETE HOURS TOWARDS CERTIFICATION AND NOT A DEGREE WITHIN OUR TEACHER CERTIFICATION PROGRAMS.

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	Total (N)	ACT (N)	ACT COMP (x)
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	5	4	16.0
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	3	2	17.5
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	3	3	16.3
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	32	27	18.9
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	1	1	24.0
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	26	20	18.9
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	7	7	19.4
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	1	0	0.0
311	Sec Education/English	47	30	21.1
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	12	10	20.4
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	3	1	18.0
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	5	5	19.6
334	K-12 Education/French	1	1	24.0
335	K-12 Ed/German	1	0	0.0
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	5	4	20.5
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	11	4	18.0
370	Art	1	1	22.0
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	33	32	19.1
376	K-12 Education/Art	1	1	19.0
385	Sec Education/Biology	24	18	20.1
386	Earth Science Education	1	0	0.0
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	15	4	22.9
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	7	5	24.8
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	1	0	0.0
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	1	1	21.0
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	3	3	25.7
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	2	1	21.0
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	40	27	20.9
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	38	29	20.7
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	8	8	22.6
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	24	20	20.3
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	6	4	16.3
446	Music Voice/Funct	2	2	26.0
459	Sec Education/Math	33	30	24.3
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	17	13	23.1
469	K-12 Education/Art	7	7	19.4
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	22	18	19.4
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	16	13	19.4
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	24	20	19.5
720	Elementary Ed Funct	493	399	18.7
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	85	70	17.3
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	11	7	21.1
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	10	9	19.0
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	44	32	17.4
744	Physical Education/Secondary	61	43	18.2
784	Special Ed/Elementary	85	63	17.6
785	Special Ed/Secondary	1	1	16.0
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	13	10	19.9
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	12	10	18.7
936	Early Childhhood Education	2	2	18.0
TOTALS---AVERAGES		1306	1022	19.2

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	CMSU Reg (N)	Reg Sem (T)	Reg Sem (x)
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	2	21.0	10.5
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	0	0.0	0.0
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	3	30.6	10.2
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	21	223.4	10.6
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	0	0.0	0.0
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	10	89.6	9.0
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	3	31.0	10.3
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	0	0.0	0.0
311	Sec Education/English	21	201.8	9.6
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	5	47.0	9.4
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	0	0.0	0.0
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	1	10.6	10.6
334	K-12 Education/French	0	0.0	0.0
335	K-12 Ed/German	0	0.0	0.0
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	0	0.0	0.0
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	5	50.0	10.0
370	Art	0	0.0	0.0
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	16	151.2	9.5
376	K-12 Education/Art	1	10.0	10.0
385	Sec Education/Biology	11	115.1	10.5
386	Earth Science Education	0	0.0	0.0
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	5	51.0	10.2
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	4	40.0	10.0
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	1	9.0	9.0
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	1	11.0	11.0
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	2	21.0	10.5
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	0	0.0	0.0
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	12	109.6	9.1
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	15	153.9	10.3
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	7	79.2	11.3
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	17	185.9	10.9
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	2	20.6	10.3
446	Music Voice/Funct	1	10.0	10.0
459	Sec Education/Math	10	93.9	9.4
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	10	92.9	9.3
469	K-12 Education/Art	3	39.3	13.1
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	10	99.2	9.9
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	7	62.1	8.9
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	10	104.8	10.5
720	Elementary Ed Funct	196	1876.7	9.6
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	42	411.9	9.8
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	6	61.0	10.2
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	5	51.6	10.3
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	12	122.0	10.2
744	Physical Education/Secondary	28	306.7	11.0
784	Special Ed/Elementary	31	306.9	9.9
785	Special Ed/Secondary	0	0.0	0.0
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	5	48.5	9.7
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	6	59.2	9.9
936	Early Childhhood Education	2	20.0	10.0
TOTALS---AVERAGES		549	5429.2	9.9

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	"8 Sem" (N)	Reg Hours (T)	Reg Hrs/Sem
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	0	311.0	14.8
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	0	0.0	0.0
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	1	462.5	15.1
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	2	3019.0	13.5
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	0	0.0	0.0
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	3	1306.0	14.6
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	0	441.0	14.2
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	0	0.0	0.0
311	Sec Education/English	6	2855.5	14.2
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	1	676.5	14.4
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	0	0.0	0.0
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	0	128.0	12.1
334	K-12 Education/French	0	0.0	0.0
335	K-12 Ed/German	0	0.0	0.0
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	0	0.0	0.0
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	1	679.0	13.9
370	Art	0	0.0	0.0
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	5	2203.5	14.6
376	K-12 Education/Art	0	148.0	14.8
385	Sec Education/Biology	1	1544.0	13.4
386	Earth Science Education	0	0.0	0.0
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	0	750.0	14.7
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	0	557.0	13.9
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	0	132.0	14.7
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	0	136.0	12.4
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	0	288.0	13.7
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	0	0.0	0.0
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	1	1823.5	16.6
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	2	2268.0	14.7
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	0	1273.0	16.1
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	1	2898.0	15.6
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	0	315.5	15.3
446	Music Voice/Funct	0	173.0	17.3
459	Sec Education/Math	3	1413.5	15.1
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	2	1350.0	14.5
469	K-12 Education/Art	0	452.0	11.5
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	2	1368.0	13.8
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	1	935.0	15.1
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	0	1448.5	13.8
720	Elementary Ed Funct	46	26888.1	14.3
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	6	5686.0	13.8
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	0	879.9	14.4
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	0	651.0	12.6
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	0	1718.0	14.1
744	Physical Education/Secondary	1	4061.0	13.2
784	Special Ed/Elementary	6	4359.0	14.2
785	Special Ed/Secondary	0	0.0	0.0
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	1	671.0	13.8
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	1	828.0	14.0
936	Early Childhhood Education	0	292.0	14.6
TOTALS---AVERAGES		93	77407.0	14.3

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	Reg Deg Hrs (x)	Trans (N)	Trans Sem (T)
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	155.5	3	22.3
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	0.0	3	32.9
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	154.2	0	0.0
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	143.8	11	85.9
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	0.0	1	8.6
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	130.6	16	127.1
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	147.0	4	39.6
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	0.0	1	4.0
311	Sec Education/English	136.0	26	184.4
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	135.3	7	40.0
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	0.0	3	29.6
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	128.0	4	28.6
334	K-12 Education/French	0.0	1	11.0
335	K-12 Ed/German	0.0	1	10.0
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	0.0	5	38.0
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	139.4	6	43.2
370	Art	0.0	1	4.0
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	137.7	17	136.8
376	K-12 Education/Art	148.0	0	0.0
385	Sec Education/Biology	140.4	13	91.8
386	Earth Science Education	0.0	1	6.0
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	150.0	10	103.2
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	139.3	3	21.6
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	132.0	0	0.0
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	136.0	0	0.0
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	144.0	1	6.0
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	0.0	2	17.0
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	152.0	28	224.9
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	151.2	23	170.5
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	181.9	1	10.0
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	170.5	7	67.2
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	157.8	4	33.0
446	Music Voice/Funct	173.0	1	7.0
459	Sec Education/Math	141.4	23	188.8
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	135.0	7	54.1
469	K-12 Education/Art	150.7	4	37.3
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	136.8	12	104.6
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	133.6	9	66.6
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	144.9	14	110.8
720	Elementary Ed Funct	137.2	297	2298.9
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	135.4	43	353.5
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	146.7	5	40.9
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	130.2	5	34.0
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	143.2	32	257.5
744	Physical Education/Secondary	145.0	33	250.4
784	Special Ed/Elementary	140.6	54	462.0
785	Special Ed/Secondary	0.0	1	12.0
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	134.2	8	64.8
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	138.0	6	43.6
936	Early Childhhood Education	146.0	0	0.0
TOTALS---AVERAGES		141.0	757	5989.0

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	Trans Sem (x)	Trans Hrs (T)	Trans Hrs (x)
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	7.4	142.0	47.3
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	11.0	30.0	10.0
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	0.0	0.0	0.0
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	7.8	393.3	35.8
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	8.6	94.8	94.8
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	7.9	722.9	45.2
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	9.9	92.0	23.0
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	4.0	98.0	98.0
311	Sec Education/English	7.1	1276.5	49.1
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	5.7	392.0	56.0
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	9.9	45.0	15.0
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	7.2	128.8	32.2
334	K-12 Education/French	11.0	3.0	3.0
335	K-12 Ed/German	10.0	19.0	19.0
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	7.6	161.0	32.2
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	7.2	249.3	41.6
370	Art	4.0	64.0	64.0
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	8.1	755.0	44.4
376	K-12 Education/Art	0.0	0.0	0.0
385	Sec Education/Biology	7.1	737.6	56.7
386	Earth Science Education	6.0	31.0	31.0
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	10.3	389.0	38.9
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	7.2	176.0	58.7
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	0.0	0.0	0.0
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	0.0	0.0	0.0
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	6.0	58.0	58.0
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	8.5	106.0	53.0
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	8.0	1194.8	42.7
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	7.4	1074.2	46.7
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	10.0	7.0	7.0
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	9.6	79.0	11.3
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	8.3	131.0	32.8
446	Music Voice/Funct	7.0	9.0	9.0
459	Sec Education/Math	8.2	509.1	22.1
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	7.7	351.0	50.1
469	K-12 Education/Art	9.3	49.0	12.3
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	8.7	508.4	42.4
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	7.4	391.5	43.5
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	7.9	678.0	48.4
720	Elementary Ed Funct	7.7	12227.1	41.2
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	8.2	1564.0	36.4
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	8.2	179.0	35.8
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	6.8	316.0	63.2
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	8.1	1348.5	42.1
744	Physical Education/Secondary	7.6	1279.2	38.7
784	Special Ed/Elementary	8.6	1941.8	36.0
785	Special Ed/Secondary	12.0	35.0	35.0
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	8.1	198.4	24.8
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	7.3	206.0	34.3
936	Early Childhhood Education	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTALS---AVERAGES		7.9	30441.2	40.2

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	T-CMSU Hrs (T)	T-CMSU Hrs (x)	T-CMSU Hr/Sem
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	271.0	90.3	12.2
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	437.5	145.8	13.3
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	0.0	0.0	0.0
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	1146.2	104.2	13.3
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	98.0	98.0	12.3
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	1798.5	112.4	14.2
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	464.0	116.0	11.7
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	55.0	55.0	13.8
311	Sec Education/English	2484.4	95.6	13.5
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	581.0	83.0	14.5
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	356.0	118.7	12.0
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	401.0	100.3	14.0
334	K-12 Education/French	128.0	128.0	11.6
335	K-12 Ed/German	167.0	167.0	16.7
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	531.0	106.2	14.0
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	655.0	109.2	15.2
370	Art	62.0	62.0	15.5
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	1747.5	102.8	12.8
376	K-12 Education/Art	0.0	0.0	0.0
385	Sec Education/Biology	1234.0	94.9	13.4
386	Earth Science Education	97.0	97.0	16.2
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	1288.0	128.8	12.5
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	273.5	91.2	12.7
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	0.0	0.0	0.0
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	0.0	0.0	0.0
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	82.0	82.0	13.7
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	184.0	92.0	10.8
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	2983.5	106.6	13.3
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	2075.0	90.2	12.2
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	185.0	185.0	18.5
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	1109.0	158.4	16.5
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	468.5	117.1	14.2
446	Music Voice/Funct	131.5	131.5	18.8
459	Sec Education/Math	2740.5	119.2	14.5
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	659.0	94.1	12.2
469	K-12 Education/Art	489.0	122.3	13.1
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	1281.0	106.8	12.3
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	859.0	95.4	12.9
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	1284.0	91.7	11.6
720	Elementary Ed Funct	30170.5	101.6	13.1
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	4760.5	110.7	13.5
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	568.0	113.6	13.9
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	463.0	92.6	13.6
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	3386.0	105.8	13.2
744	Physical Education/Secondary	3566.0	108.1	14.2
784	Special Ed/Elementary	6029.0	111.6	13.1
785	Special Ed/Secondary	127.0	127.0	10.6
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	912.5	114.1	14.1
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	598.0	99.7	13.7
936	Early Childhhood Education	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTALS---AVERAGES		79400.1	104.9	13.3

MJR Code	MAJOR TITLES	T- Deg Hrs (x)		
112	Sec Ed/ Voc Agri Ed Funct	137.6		
129	Sec Ed/Child Dev Funct	155.8		
130	Sec Ed/ Gen Home Econ	0.0		
132	Sec Ed/Voc Home Econ Funct	140.0		
167	Indust Art & Tech Funct	192.8		
170	K-12 Ed/IA & Tech	157.6		
171	K-12 Ed/ IA & Tech Funct	139.0		
195	Sec Ed/ Driver & Safety Ed	153.0		
311	Sec Education/English	144.7		
313	Sec Ed/ English-Funct	139.0		
315	Sec Ed/ English-Gen Funct	133.7		
316	Sec Ed/English-Sp & Th Funct	132.5		
334	K-12 Education/French	131.0		
335	K-12 Ed/German	186.0		
337	K-12 Ed/Spanish	138.8		
362	Sec Ed/Sp Comm & Th	150.8		
370	Art	126.0		
375	K-12 Ed/Art Funct	147.2		
376	K-12 Education/Art	0.0		
385	Sec Education/Biology	151.6		
386	Earth Science Education	128.0		
389	Sec Ed/Earth Science	167.7		
394	Sec Ed/Chemistry	149.9		
399	Sec Ed/Phy &Chem Funct	0.0		
401	Sec Ed/Physics & Math Funct	0.0		
402	Sec Ed/Physics & Science Funct	140.0		
409	Sec Ed/ Junior High Science	145.0		
415	Sec Ed/ Social Studies	149.3		
416	Sec Ed/Social Studies Funct	136.9		
434	Music/Inst Music Funct	192.0		
440	Mustic Ed/Inst Funct	169.7		
441	Music Ed/Vocal Funct	149.9		
446	Music Voice/Funct	140.5		
459	Sec Education/Math	141.3		
461	Sec Ed/Math Funct	144.2		
469	K-12 Education/Art	134.5		
524	Sec Ed/Business Ed	149.1		
525	Sec Ed/ Business Ed Funct	138.9		
527	Sec Ed/ Dist Education Funct	140.1		
720	Elementary Ed Funct	142.8		
722	El Ed/Early Child Ed Funct	147.1		
724	El Ed/Mid Sch/Jr Hi Sch Funct	149.4		
733	Physical Ed/ Elem	155.8		
734	Physical Ed/ General Funct	147.9		
744	Physical Education/Secondary	146.8		
784	Special Ed/Elementary	147.6		
785	Special Ed/Secondary	162.0		
805	K-12 Ed/Speech Path	138.9		
806	K-12 Ed/Speech Path Funct Opt 1	134.0		
936	Early Childhhood Education	0.0		
TOTALS---AVERAGES		145.1		

	Total (N)	ACT (N)	ACT COMP (x)	CMSU Reg (N)	Reg Sem (T)
Elementary	589	476	18.6	244	2349.6
Secondary	631	482	20.3	274	2772.7
Special Ed	86	64	17.6	31	306.9
TOTALS-AVERAGE	1306	1022	19.2	549	5429.2
	Reg Sem (x)	"8 Sem" (N)	Reg Hours (T)	Reg Hrs/Sem	Reg Deg Hrs (x)
Elementary	9.6	52	33454.0	14.2	137.1
Secondary	10.1	35	39594.0	14.3	144.5
Special Ed	9.9	6	4359.0	14.2	140.6
TOTALS-AVERAGE	9.9	93	77407.0	14.3	141.0
	Trans (N)	Trans Sem (T)	Trans Sem (x)	Trans Hrs (T)	Trans Hrs (x)
Elementary	345	2693.3	7.8	13970.1	40.5
Secondary	357	2821.7	7.9	14494.3	40.6
Special Ed	55	474.0	8.6	1976.8	35.9
TOTALS-AVERAGE	757	5989.0	7.9	30441.2	40.2
	T-CMSU Hrs (T)	T-CMSU Hr (x)	T-CMSU Hr/Sem	T- Deg Hrs (x)	
Elementary	35499.0	102.9	13.2	143.4	
Secondary	37722.1	105.7	13.4	146.3	
Special Ed	6156.0	111.9	13.0	147.8	
TOTALS-AVERAGE	79400.1	104.9	13.3	145.1	

A COMPARISON OF ALL 1984 THROUGH 1989 ELEMENTARY EDUCATION GRADUATES

This following data is a subset of the previous 12 pages. However, it is based on only Elementary Education graduates by semester of degree completion with the same column headings that were used in the full BSE and BME comparisons.

Elementary Education Majors, 1984-1989 Graduate Data For CMSU Regular and Transfer Students					
Semester	CMSU Reg (N)	Reg Sem (T)	Reg Sem (x)	"8 sem" (N)	Reg Hours (T)
841	5	49.0	9.8	1	724.0
842	12	112.5	9.4	3	1671.0
844	36	339.6	9.4	10	4814.0
851	3	31.1	10.4	0	435.5
852	11	109.1	9.9	0	1488.0
854	41	370.2	9.0	8	5628.8
861	3	43.2	14.4	0	469.5
862	20	204.6	10.2	0	2681.0
864	21	198.2	9.4	8	2835.0
871	4	40.2	10.1	0	545.0
872	7	66.6	9.5	1	1017.0
874	23	218.3	9.5	4	3117.0
881	2	19.0	9.5	0	259.0
882	12	113.0	9.4	3	1613.0
884	23	221.3	9.6	7	3242.0
891	3	30.6	10.2	0	400.0
892	18	183.2	10.2	1	2513.7
Totals/Averages	244	2349.6	9.6	52	33454.0
Semester	Reg Deg Hrs.	Trans (N)	Trans Sem (T)	Trans Sem (x)	Trans Hrs (T)
841	144.8	2	10.7	5.4	163.0
842	139.3	10	63.8	6.4	913.0
844	133.7	16	104.8	6.6	1493.0
851	145.2	5	42.5	8.5	387.0
852	135.3	18	120.7	6.7	1757.5
854	137.3	23	170.3	7.4	2295.5
861	156.5	5	45.0	9.0	502.0
862	135.0	26	221.0	8.5	2930.5
864	130.2	41	324.2	7.9	4219.5
871	136.3	7	43.0	6.1	566.0
872	145.3	34	272.9	8.0	3627.0
874	135.5	48	356.8	7.4	4885.0
881	129.5	12	107.3	8.9	1289.0
882	141.0	17	123.6	7.3	1794.0
884	136.6	36	292.6	8.1	3774.0
891	133.3	10	80.6	8.6	1023.0
892	139.7	35	313.5	9.0	3881.0
Totals/Averages	137.1	345	2693.3	7.8	35499.0

Elementary Education Majors, 1984-1989 Graduate Data For CMSU Regular and Transfer Students					
Semester	Trans Hrs (x)	T-CMSU Hrs (T)	T-CMSU Hrs (x)	T-Deg Hrs (x)	Total (N)
841	81.5	109.0	54.5	136.0	7
842	91.3	615.8	61.5	152.8	22
844	93.3	689.0	43.1	136.4	52
851	77.4	241.0	48.2	125.6	8
852	97.6	972.4	54.0	151.6	29
854	99.8	982.6	42.7	142.5	64
861	100.4	227.0	45.4	145.8	8
862	112.7	878.0	33.8	146.5	46
864	102.9	1583.6	38.6	141.5	62
871	80.9	521.0	74.4	155.3	11
872	106.9	1290.3	38.0	144.7	41
874	101.8	2023.0	42.6	144.4	71
881	107.4	367.5	30.6	138.0	14
882	105.5	643.0	37.8	143.3	29
884	104.8	1136.6	31.6	136.4	59
891	102.3	413.0	41.3	143.6	13
892	110.3	1277.3	36.5	146.8	53
Totals/Averages	102.9	13970.1	40.5	143.4	589

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDUCATION GRADUATES, 1984-1989.

The ACT composite score has been used as part of the full admission process on the CMSU campus since 1981. An 18 composite score is one of the requirements for full admission to the program. Should a student not score an 18 composite after two attempts, the student may then take the California Achievement Test (CAT), and if successful, use that score as part of the full admission process.

The following data is a listing of Incoming ACT Composite scores for all BSE and BME graduates by graduation year. Of the 1306 graduates, 1022 had incoming scores recorded on the university tapes with an average score of 19.1.

The student who did not have a composite score of 18, or no score at all, subsequently retook the test, or took the test for the first time. All graduates need to achieve an 18 composite on the ACT or successful completion of the CAT to be certified.

The university tapes do not reflect subsequent ACT scores because the process has never been enacted. All records of ACT and CAT scores after the initial entry to the university are housed in the Office of Clinical Services.

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDUCATION GRADUATES, 1984-1989				
Semesters	Total (N)	ACT (N)	no scores (N)	ACT (x)
841-844	207	146	61	18.5
851-854	226	183	43	19.3
861-864	248	195	53	19.0
871-874	264	207	57	19.7
881-884	243	203	40	19.5
891-892	118	88	30	18.0
Totals/Average	1306	1022	284	19.1

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 1150 STUDENTS, 1987-1990

The Department of Curriculum and Instruction's course "Introduction to Professional Education", EDCI 1150, was instituted in the Fall semester of 1987. This course is a required introduction for all Elementary Education majors who intend to complete a degree at CMSU. Most of the students who enroll in the course are freshmen. Approximately 25% of the students are transfers or CMSU sophomores.

The average ACT composite for the 837, EDCI 1150 students is 17.5. A total of 595 students (71%) had an incoming composite score. Updates of their ACT scores are not on the university tapes but are housed in the Office of Clinical Services.

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 1150 STUDENTS, 1987-1990				
Semester	Total (N)	ACT (N)	no scores	ACT (x)
Fall 87	179	118	61	18.1
Spr 88	48	39	9	17.3
Fall 88	165	145	20	17.1
Spr 89	75	57	18	17.0
Fall 89	262	184	78	17.5
Spr 90	108	52	56	18.1
Totals/Average	837	595	242	17.5

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 2100 STUDENTS, 1984-1989

Foundations of Education, EDCI 2100, has been the basic entry level class. It covers educational philosophy, history, and the schools' role in society. It is part of a block of classes which also includes Educational Psychology and Field Experience I. Since the summer of 1984 through the Fall of 1989, 2569 have completed EDCI 2100. A total of 1750 students (68%) had an incoming ACT composite of 18.8. Those students who continued on through the teacher education program who scored below 18 or did not have a test score took the exam that is required for the full admission process. As mentioned in previous sections, if the student did not achieve an 18 composite after two attempts she/he could instead take the CAT as an alternative. The CMSU tapes do not reflect these subsequent scores after initial enrollment. The scores are housed in the Office of Clinical Services.

INCOMING ACT COMPOSITE SCORES FOR ALL EDCI 2100 STUDENTS, 1984-1989				
Semester	Total (N)	ACT (N)	no scores (N)	ACT (x)
Sum 84	13	5	8	22.0
Fall 84	214	125	89	18.6
Spr 85	165	103	62	16.7
Sum 85	14	7	7	20.9
Fall 85	192	120	72	19.1
Spr 86	165	120	45	18.6
Sum 86	14	7	7	22.4
Fall 86	242	189	53	18.9
Spr 87	207	146	61	18.5
Sum 87	18	9	9	21.8
Fall 87	277	198	79	20.0
Spr 88	215	154	61	19.0
Sum 88	28	18	10	17.7
Fall 88	275	209	66	19.1
Spr 89	218	146	72	19.0
Sum 89	11	6	5	20.8
Fall 89	301	188	113	18.5
Total/Averages	2569	1750	819	18.8

C-BASE SCORES FOR ALL CMSU STUDENTS -- 4/88 THROUGH 3/90

Students who wish to complete a teacher education degree in Missouri need to successfully complete The College Basic Academic Subjects Examination, (C-BASE) as part of the admission process into teacher education. This became effective on September 1, 1988 as part of the 1985 "Excellence in Education Act." C-BASE is a criterion-referenced achievement examination focusing on the knowledge and skills requisite to successful college course work. It contains five examination areas: Writing, English, Math, Social Studies, and Science. Since the first offering of C-BASE in April of 1988, 548 CMSU students had submitted test scores to the university as part of their teacher education admission process. The following page show s a matrix per test, by number of successful attempts, unsuccessful attempts with frequencies, cumulative frequencies, percents and cumulative percents. The left hand column of the matrix requires the following explanation in order to interpret the data:

1 = One attempt, successful

2 = Two attempts, successful

3 = Three attempts, successful

4 = Four attempts, successful

5 = Five attempts, successful

A = One attempts, unsuccessful

B = Two attempts, unsuccessful

C = Three attempts, unsuccessful

D = Four attempts, unsuccessful

E = Five attempts, unsuccessful

Overall, 62% of the students had success on all 5 test components on their first attempt. The remaining 38% were not successful or became successful on subsequent attempts.

English	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Frequency	Cum. Percent
A	44	8.0	44	8.0
B	4	0.7	48	8.8
D	1	0.2	49	8.9
1	466	85.0	515	94.0
2	24	4.4	539	98.4
3	8	1.5	547	99.8
4	1	0.2	548	100.0

Writing	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Frequency	Cum. Percent
A	21	3.8	21	3.8
B	1	0.2	22	4.0
D	1	0.2	23	4.2
1	490	89.4	513	93.6
2	26	4.7	539	98.4
3	8	1.5	547	99.8
4	1	0.2	548	100.0

Math	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Frequency	Cum. Percent
A	41	7.5	41	7.5
B	6	1.1	47	8.6
C	3	0.5	50	9.1
D	2	0.4	52	9.5
E	2	0.4	54	9.9
1	460	83.9	514	93.8
2	25	4.6	539	98.4
3	6	1.1	545	99.5
4	1	0.2	546	99.6
5	2	0.4	548	100.0

Science	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Frequency	Cum. Percent
A	41	7.5	41	7.5
B	2	0.4	43	7.8
E	1	0.2	44	8.0
1	461	84.1	505	92.2
2	37	6.8	542	98.9
3	6	1.1	548	100.0

Socstud	Frequency	Percent	Cum. Frequency	Cum. Percent
A	42	7.7	42	7.7
B	8	1.5	50	9.1
E	1	0.2	51	9.3
1	465	84.9	516	94.2
2	22	4.0	538	98.2
3	8	1.5	546	99.6
4	1	0.2	547	99.8
5	1	0.2	548	100.0

PROGRAM RETENTION 1984 THROUGH 1989 BASED ON EDCI 2100 ENROLLMENT

Foundations of Education, EDCI 2100, has been the general entry course for most all students enrolled in a BSE or BME program at CMSU. It is also a class where the student usually makes a decision of whether to continue in the Teacher Education program, choose another program of study at CMSU or elsewhere, or drop out of higher education on a temporary or permanent basis for financial, personal or academic reasons. The following matrix addresses all 2569 students who completed EDCI 2100 from August 1984 through December 1989. An explanation of the column headings is as follows:

Semester: CMSU coding 841 = summer 1984, 842 = fall 1984, and 844 = spring1985.

Total (N): number of students completing EDCI 2100 per semester.

ND: number of students not completing a degree.

In: number of students remaining enrolled at CMSU.

Out: number of students not currently enrolled at CMSU.

Cert: number of students who completed EDCI 2100 for certification purposes only.

22: number of students completing an Associate of Science degree (2-year.

41: number of students completing a Bachelor of Education degree.

42: number of students completing a Bachelor of Arts degree.

43: number of students completing a Bachelor of Science degree.

44: number of students completing a Bachelor of Music degree.

45: number of students completing a Bachelor of Music Education degree.

46: number of students completing a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration.

47: number of students completing a Bachelor of Fine Arts degree.

51: number of students completing a Master of Science in Education degree.

52: number of students completing a Master of Arts degree.

53: number of students completing a Master of Science degree.

T/D: Total number of degrees granted by CMSU to students who completed EDCI 2100.

Ed/D: Total number of students completing Education Degrees, i.e., Bachelor of Science in Education, Bachelor of Music Education, and Master of Science in Education.

After examination of the data, some interesting findings emerge with respect to success in higher education. Of the 2569 Foundations of Education students, 848 have completed degrees at CMSU, 52 have completed certificates and 1134 are still enrolled in some type of degree program. That represents a total of 2034 students, or 79%, who are still enrolled or who have completed a degree at CMSU. The remaining 535 students, or 21% of the population, have either dropped out of school for financial, martial, military move, family move, academic shortcoming, transferring to another institution, or other reason. It is estimated that 5% (identified because of their GPA at the time of departure) approximately 130 students have transferred to other Missouri institutions of Higher Education and completed a 2 or 4 year degree program. This then shows that EDCI has at least an 84% success rate with success being defined as completion of a degree or continued enrollment within a program.

For those students who have moved out of state or who might enter the degree pool at a later date we have no findings on which to base any conclusions. We do know that approximately 5-7% of the students did not meet CMSU academic standards and have left the institution. They might have entered other programs at other institutions of higher education in Missouri or out of state. We just do not know the answers to this group.

We can conclude that Foundations of Education has contributed to the success of 84% of its participants over the past 6 years.

Sem	Total (N)	ND	In	out	Cert	22	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	51	52	53	T/D	Ed/D
841	13	5	0	4	1	0	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	8	5
842	214	52	6	44	2	2	119	5	21	0	6	4	1	3	0	1	162	128
844	165	72	10	57	5	1	75	1	13	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	93	76
851	14	8	2	2	4	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	2
852	192	61	8	47	6	1	111	2	11	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	131	114
854	165	63	10	49	4	0	80	5	11	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	102	83
861	14	7	0	3	4	0	3	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	7	4
862	242	90	33	46	11	0	119	4	24	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	152	122
864	207	116	52	60	4	0	76	2	9	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	91	78
871	18	11	5	5	1	1	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	5
872	277	220	163	55	2	1	40	2	10	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	57	42
874	215	197	146	46	5	0	9	1	5	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	18	12
881	28	22	11	9	2	0	3	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	3
882	275	270	219	50	1	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	5	3
884	218	217	160	57	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
891	11	9	8	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	0
892	301	301	301	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
T/A	2569	1721	1134	535	52	6	650	24	114	5	18	11	4	9	4	4	848	677

REFERENCES

Kunkel, R. (1988, July). NCATE: Now you have the whole story. Paper presented at the NCA/AACTE Teacher Education workshop, Jonesboro, AR.

Manning, T. (1980). The why, what and who of assessment: The accrediting association perspective. Chicago, IL: North Central Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 284 893).

Zelazek, J. (1989). Assessment is part of life: Reduce fears, anxiety and stress. In Donald W. Jones (Ed.), Preparing for NCATE: Criteria for compliance--external evaluation. Muncie, IN: Ball State University Press.

Zelazek, J., Lamson, S., Sylwester, J., and Downs, B. (1989). The education assessment committee 1989 follow-up report. Warrensburg, MO: Central Missouri State University Press.

Zelazek, J., Lamson, S., Sylwester, J., and Downs, B. (1990). Evaluation and dissemination: A dynamic system to keep teacher education programs meaningful. Paper presented at the ATE convention, Las Vegas, NV and AACTE convention, Chicago, IL.